

Message

---

**From:** Scott, Denise [Scott.Denise@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** 4/6/2018 12:41:12 PM  
**To:** Liljegren, Jennifer [Liljegren.Jennifer@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** RE: response to comment

Thanks Jenny, I will ask Carla!

---

**From:** Liljegren, Jennifer  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:02 PM  
**To:** Scott, Denise <Scott.Denise@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** D'Agostino, Kathleen <dagostino.kathleen@epa.gov>; Svingen, Eric <Svingen.Eric@epa.gov>; Rosenthal, Steven <rosenthal.steven@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** response to comment

Hi Denise,

I realized I have another comment (see below) for which OAQPS might have a response.

I do not think that I included this one in previous emails with our list of comments for which we were seeking assistance from OAQPS.

Thanks,  
 Jenny

***Business operations (existing and new)***

**Comment:** Commenters 0266, 0308, 0259, 0247, 0250, 0244, 0274, 0285, and 0308 alluded to or expressed concerns about economic growth and business operations. In particular, commenter 0266 is concerned about possible implications of nonattainment such as WDNR developing a SIP mandating emissions reductions from existing sources and emissions offsets for the permitting of new sources, with specific emphasis on an electronics manufacturing district planned for construction in Racine County. Commenter 0310 indicated that EPA's potential nonattainment designations impose a heavy regulatory load on businesses and industry and threaten the well-being of the state's economy. Commenter 0285 is concerned about a negative connotation associated with and difficulty attracting new businesses and residents to nonattainment areas.

**Response:** ask OAQPS (e-mail Denise?) if they have boilerplate response indicating NAAQS are health-based standards, NAAQS nonattainment area designations do not take cost into consideration only implicit benefit of human health protection?